UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,977	06/14/2007	Mark Ashby	1001.2219102	1136
	7590	EXAMINER		
1221 NICOLLI SUITE 800			MASHACK, MARK F	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3773	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

T	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/595,977	ASHBY ET AL.	
l	Examiner	Art Unit	

	MARK MASHACK	3773	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Anno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FILE	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the property of the company of the notice of Appeal has been filed.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12) 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); The ser form for appeal by materially reconcerns and some sources of finally rejected and 41.33(a)). The service of Non-Cotons and Ser	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying the ected claims.	ne issues for
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	າ of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claim limitation "a resilient extension member releasably coupled to the hemostatic material" requires an additional search and consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues that "nowhere does Hannam appear to teach or suggest, 'a flexible plug... being sized to circumferentially cover the blood vessel puncture site and further being sufficiently flexible to conform to and seal the blood vessel puncture site". Examiner disagrees. Hannam explicility discloses "an anchor member or other closure therein for temporarily hemostatically sealing the puncture and then injecting a gelatinous or other hemostatically material" (Column 3, Lines 51-58, Column 4, Lines 31-37, Column 4, Lines 54-57, Column 7, Lines 12-14,...). Furthermore, Hannam explicitly discloses the anchor being able to "expand or unfold to an enlarged configuration suitable for closing off the puncture generally along the artery "(Column 7, Lines 41-46) "yet is sufficiently flexible or pliable to conform generally to the shape of the interior of the artery" (Column 7, Lines 34-37).

Applicant argues that "the surface of the injectable material of Hannam does not appear to be inherently differentiated from the bulk material and thus does not appear to 'encapsulate' the remaing material". Examiner disagrees. Encapsulation does not require differentiation between materials. Encapsulation just requires surrounding. The outer layer inherently encapsulates the inside of the material.

Applicant argues that "the release mechanism also requires 'a resilient extension member coupled to the hemostatic material opposite the flexible plug" In the claim language "opposite" provides no relative term. The resilient extension member is "coupled" to the hemostatic material and is positioned opposite the flexible plug relative to the blood vessel. Applicant attempts to imply additional meaning to the claim language but that meaning is not claimed. Applicant argues that "the filament does not appear to be 'resilient'" but does not justify the argument. Examiner asserts that a filament can be considered resilient.

Applicant argues that "couple' has been used in its ordinary dictionary meaning of 'to fastener together' and there appears to be no indication in the cited text that the gelatinous material and the disk even come in contact". Examiner disagrees. The broadest reasonable definition of the term "couple" is "something that joins or connects two things together". This does not require contact. The plunger ejects the hemostatic body to join the flexible disk in the puncture in order to seal the blood vessel.